

Glottal Constriction in Gorum

Felix Rau

(Leiden University)

October 26, 2009



Glottal elements in Gorum

Glottal elements

Glottal Stop
Pre-Glottalized
Obstruents
Creaky Voice
Phonemic status
Summary

Previous Accounts

Aze's Analysis
Zide's Analysis
Comparison

Prosodic Phonology

Syllable Structure
Phonological Stem
Suffixes
Syllabification

Historical Evidence

Conclusion

Phenomena

- glottal stop: ʔ
- pre-glottalized voiced obstruents: ʔb, ʔd, ʔt, ʔg
- creaky voice: ʘ

Problems

- phonemic status
- phonological analysis
- historical situation of creaky voice

Glottal elements

Glottal Stop

Pre-Glottalized
Obstruents
Creaky Voice
Phonemic status
Summary

Previous Accounts

Aze's Analysis
Zide's Analysis
Comparison

Prosodic Phonology

Syllable Structure
Phonological Stem
Suffixes
Syllabification

Historical Evidence

Conclusion

Contrastiveness

- (1) *da* 'do!'
- (2) *daʔ* 'water'

Phonetics

- (3) [gaʔ] 'eat!'
- (4) [gaʔ^atu] 'he will eat'
- (5) [gaʔ^aru] 'he has eaten'
- (6) [tiʔⁱtu] 'he will pull'

Pre-Glottalized Obstruents

Contrastiveness

- contrastiveness is problematic

(7) *ɔaʔbu* 'to cover'

(8) *ɔabu* 'money'

Phonetics

(9) [gaʔd̚] 'cut!'

(10) [gaʔd^htu] 'he will cut'

(11) [gaʔd^hru] 'he has cut'

(12) [seʔb^mtu] 'he will chop'

(13) [taʔjtu] 'he will give'

Creaky Voice

Contrastiveness

(14) *ǰ* 'husking pit'

(15) *a* 'thatch!'

Phonetics

(16) [*ǰ̚*] 'husking pit'

(17) [*su̚r̚*] 'hunting'

(18) [*ǰ̚su̚ŋ*] 'house'

Minimal Pairs

- ʔO vs. ʔN

qaʔ 'water'

qaʔd 'for'

kindaʔn 'river-LOC'

- ʔO vs. ʋN

neŋ 'COND:MED'

kinmeʔd 'goat'

- Vʔ vs. ʋ

no good minimal pair!

qaʔ 'water'

ʔsun 'house'

Glottal elements

Glottal Stop
Pre-Glottalized
Obstruents
Creaky Voice
Phonemic status
Summary

Previous Accounts

Aze's Analysis
Zide's Analysis
Comparison

Prosodic Phonology

Syllable Structure
Phonological Stem
Suffixes
Syllabification

Historical Evidence

Conclusion

Phonetic Characteristics

| | nucleus | coda |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| ʔ | unaffected | glottal stop (echo vowel) |
| ʔ ^o | partially affected | obstruent |
| ʔ̃ | fully affected | affected |

Problems

- How many distinctive phenomena?
- What level of phonology?

Previous Accounts

Aze's Analysis

- one single prosodic feature (/ʔ/) of the syllable (or rhyme)
- no distinction between creaky voice ($\underset{\sim}{V}$) and glottal stop ($Vʔ$)
- pre-glottalized obstruents analyzed as glottalization + nasal
 $ʔO \rightarrow ʔN$ and $\underset{\sim}{V} \rightarrow Vʔ$
- minimalization of possible syllable structures
(C)V(ʔ) (C)V(ʔ)N

Problem

CVʔ-N *kinɔaʔn* 'river-LOC'
CVʔO *ɔaʔd* 'for'

Aze's view

kinɔaʔn
ɔaʔn

Zide's Analysis

glottalized obstruents are not phonemic

- glottal stop $Vʔ \rightarrow Vʔ$
- creaky voice $V̤ \rightarrow VH$
- glottalized obstruents $ʔO \rightarrow O$

Problems

- phonological treatment of creaky voice “H”
- status of glottalized obstruents

(19) *ɔaʔbu* ‘to cover’

(20) *ɔabu* ‘money’

Previous Accounts

Glottal
elements

Glottal Stop
Pre-Glottalized
Obstruents
Creaky Voice
Phonemic status
Summary

Previous
Accounts

Aze's Analysis
Zide's Analysis

Comparison

Prosodic
Phonology

Syllable Structure
Phonological Stem
Suffixes
Syllabification

Historical
Evidence

Conclusion

Comparison

| | | Aze | | Zide | |
|------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|
| CV | <i>ɖa</i> 'to do' | CV | <i>ɖa</i> | CV | <i>ɖa</i> |
| CVN | <i>ɖan</i> 'to guard' | CVN | <i>ɖan</i> | CVN | <i>ɖan</i> |
| CVʔ | <i>ɖaʔ</i> 'water' | CVʔ | <i>ɖaʔ</i> | CVʔ | <i>ɖaʔ</i> |
| CVʔO | <i>ɖaʔd</i> 'for' | CVʔN | <i>ɖaʔn</i> | CVC | <i>ɖad</i> |
| ʋ̥ | <i>ɖ̥suŋ</i> 'house' | Vʔ | <i>aʔsuŋ</i> | VH | <i>aHsuŋ</i> |
| | | CVʔ | CVʔO | | ʋ̥ |
| Aze | all one, phonemic | | | | |
| Zide | phonemic | not phonemic | phonemic | phonemic | |

Prosodic Phonology

Glottal elements

Glottal Stop
Pre-Glottalized
Obstruents
Creaky Voice
Phonemic status
Summary

Previous Accounts

Aze's Analysis
Zide's Analysis
Comparison

Prosodic Phonology

Syllable Structure
Phonological Stem
Suffixes
Syllabification

Historical Evidence

Conclusion

Syllable Structure

- (C)V(C) (two very rare exceptions: $qrVC$, $CV\eta k$)
- glottal constriction connected to rhyme/coda
- clear distribution

Possible Syllables

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| (C)V | (C) \tilde{V} | (C)V? | (C)V [?] O |
| (C)VN | (C) \tilde{V} N | | |
| (C)V(j/r/l) | (C) \tilde{V} N/r/l) | | |

Phonological Stem

Constraint on Glottal elements

$\sigma_M \sigma_M$ *kanmun* 'pig'

$\sigma_M \sigma_G$ *kusoʔd* 'dog'

$\sigma_G \sigma_M$ *ʔsun* 'house'

* $\sigma_G \sigma_G$

Reduplication

(21) *zum* → *zumzum*

(22) *gaʔ* → *gagaʔ*

(23) *gaʔd* → *gagaʔd*

Causatives *ab-*

(24) *ab+soʔj* → *ab-soʔj*

(25) *ab+sun* → *aʔb-sun* (or *ʔab-*)

Phonological Stem

Distribution in the Stem

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| CV? | CVC.CV? | CVC.CVC.CV? |
| CV ^ʔ O | CVC.CV ^ʔ O | CVC.CVC.CV ^ʔ O |
| CVC | CVC.CVC | CVC.CVC.CVC |

- (26) *gaʔ* 'to eat'
(27) *seʔb* 'to chop'
(28) *bɯl* 'to be drunk'
(29) *tupaʔd* 'to thresh'
(30) *kinɔaʔ* 'river'
(31) *gɔtɯŋ* 'cloth'
(32) *biɔgi* 'cloth'

Glottal elements

Glottal Stop
Pre-Glottalized
Obstruents
Creaky Voice
Phonemic status
Summary

Previous Accounts

Aze's Analysis
Zide's Analysis
Comparison

Prosodic Phonology

Syllable Structure
Phonological Stem
Suffixes
Syllabification

Historical Evidence

Conclusion

Minimal Nominal Stems

- bisyllabic
- monosyllabic with glottal element
 - (33) *d̥aʔ* 'water'
 - (34) *baʔb* 'head'
 - (35) *ʔl* 'husking pit'
 - (36) *sur* 'hunting' cf. *sur* 'to hunt'

Creaky Voice in Loans

- CVCV → C̥VCV
 - (37) *d̥ɔpa* 'leaf bowl' from Telugu *doppa*
 - (38) *k̥aɖu* 'bangles' from Desia Oriya *kaɖu*

Affectedness/Medium

(39) *koko#-tuʔ* 'He will sit.'

(40) *ɖimaʔd#-tuʔ* 'He will sleep.'

(41) *or-giʔj#-n-aj* 'It is not visible.'

Allomorphy?

- glottal stop -ʔ
 - CVʔ
- creaky voice \checkmark
 - (C) \checkmark N
 - (C) \checkmark j

Placement

- (42) ne- koko # -tu?
1sA- sit # -NPST:AFF
 σ $\sigma\sigma$ # σ
- (43) duk # -iŋ
be # -1sU:AFF
 σ # σ
- (44) or- giʔ # -n -aj
NEG.F- see # -INF.INTR -CISL:AFF
 σ σ # σ
- (45) duk # -iŋ -aj
be # -1sU:AFF -aj
 σ # σ σ

Syllabification

Is there resyllabification?

- $ga^?d-u$ 'cut-INF:TR'
- $/ga^?d.u/$
- $/ga.^?du/$

qa.bu 'money'

qa^?b.u or *qa.^?bu* 'to cover'

Historical Evidence

Glottal elements

Glottal Stop
Pre-Glottalized
Obstruents
Creaky Voice
Phonemic status
Summary

Previous Accounts

Aze's Analysis
Zide's Analysis
Comparison

Prosodic Phonology

Syllable Structure
Phonological Stem
Suffixes
Syllabification

Historical Evidence

Conclusion

Correspondences

Gorum /ʔ/ : Sora /ʔ/ : Juray /ʔ/

Gorum /ʔd/ : Sora /d/ : Juray /d/

Gorum /ʔ/ : Sora ∅ : Juray ∅

An example

Gorum *ᵛa* 'husking pit'

Sora *ɔno:l* 'husking pit'

Gutob *saʔl* 'husking pit'

Kharia *sol* 'husking pit'

Conclusion

Summary

- There is a clear prosodic dimension to glottal constriction.
- Glottal constriction is especially connected to the (phonological) stem.
- There seems to be a connection to syllable weight.
- Historical evidence for creaky voice is problematic.

Outlook

- Focus on prosodic structure in Gorum
- Analyse glottal constriction in Juray: creaky voice/glottal stop
- What about Korku tone?

Glottal Constriction in Gorum

Felix Rau

Glottal elements

- Glottal Stop
- Pre-Glottalized Obstruents
- Creaky Voice
- Phonemic status
- Summary

Previous Accounts

- Aze's Analysis
- Zide's Analysis
- Comparison

Prosodic Phonology

- Syllable Structure
- Phonological Stem
- Suffixes
- Syllabification

Historical Evidence

Conclusion

Thank You



felix.rau@gmail.com